R E M A R K S

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner's allowance of claims 3, 4 and 7 is respectfully acknowledged.

PRIORITY

The Examiner indicates in item 1 on page 1 of the Office Action that the priority claim of the present application is improper, because according to the Examiner the filing date of the present application is September 27, 2001, which is more than one year from the June 7, 2000 filing date of the Japanese priority document 2000-170676.

It is respectfully pointed out, however, that the filing date of the present application is, in fact, June 5, 2001, as indicated on the Office Action cover sheet. And it is respectfully pointed out that the June 5, 2001 filing date of the present application is less than one year from the June 7, 2000, filing date of the Japanese priority document 2000-170676.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the priority claim of the present application is proper.

THE CLAIMS

Claim 2 has been amended to clarify that the imaging condition detected by the imaging condition detection means includes at least an imaging sensitivity of the captured image, as supported by the disclosure in the specification at, for example, page 13, lines 12-19.

No new matter has been added, and it is respectfully requested that the amendment to claim 2 be approved and entered.

THE PRIOR ART REJECTION

Claims 2, 5, 6 and 8 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious in view of the combination of newly cited USP 6,115,137 ("Ozawa et al") and newly cited USP 6,411,361 ("Hidaka et al"). These rejections, however, are respectfully traversed.

According to the claimed present invention, a pre-print process for image data of a captured image is performed in accordance with an imaging condition of the captured image. As recited in amended independent claim 2, the imaging condition (which is a condition relating to the actual imaging of the captured image) includes at least an imaging sensitivity of the captured image. And according to the claimed present invention, the imaging condition is detected by the printer apparatus based on information relating to the imaging condition, which is added to the image data of the captured image.

The quality of an image to be printed depends significantly on the imaging condition of the captured image. Significantly, according to the claimed present invention information relating to the imaging condition is attached to a captured image, and the printer apparatus detects the imaging condition. Therefore, there is no need for a user to input the imaging condition and potentially make mistakes. In addition, the imaging condition according to the present invention as recited in amended independent claim 2 includes at least an imaging sensitivity of the captured image. Thus, the imaging condition relates to a condition of capturing the image.

The Examiner has referred to the HQ and HS modes disclosed by Ozawa et al as being imaging conditions detected by imaging condition detection means.

It is respectfully pointed out that according to Ozawa et al, the HQ mode is a "high-quality (low-speed)" mode of printing, while the HS mode is a "high-speed (low quality)" mode of printing. According to Ozawa et al, the user selects the HQ mode or the HS mode by inputting a selection into the digital camera, which converts captured image data into print data in accordance with the selected mode, and then sends the print data to a printer. See column 6, line 49 to column 7, line 55.

Thus, the HQ and HS modes according to Ozawa et al correspond to printing modes, and do not at all correspond to

imaging conditions. Indeed, the selection of the HQ or HS mode is made by the user at a time of printing the image, after the image has been captured according to Ozawa et al. With this structure, the user may make a mistake in selecting an appropriate printing processing with respect to the actual imaging conditions of the image, in contrast to the structure of the claimed present invention as explained above, in which information relating to the imaging condition is added to image data of the captured image. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the modes HQ and HS of Ozawa et al are related to conditions of printing, not to conditions of imaging in the manner of the claimed present invention.

Clearly, therefore, the HQ and HS modes do not even remotely relate to an imaging condition that includes at least an imaging sensitivity of the captured image, as according to the present invention as recited in clarified amended independent claim 2.

Hidaka et al, moreover, has merely been cited for the disclosure of a printer and digital camera together.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that even if Ozawa et al and Hidaka et al were combinable in the manner suggested by the Examiner, such combination would still not disclose, teach or suggest the features of the present invention as recited in amended independent claim 2, and claim 6 depending therefrom.

In addition, with respect to claim 5, it is respectfully pointed out that the printer apparatus of claim 5 includes print zoom means for enlarging an image to be printed on a print film, and control means for limiting a magnification of the image to be printed on the print film, in accordance with the condition of use of the imaging zoom.

It is respectfully pointed out that Ozawa et al does not disclose means for performing zooming at the printer. By contrast, according to Ozawa et al, zooming is performed at the camera before transmitting image data to the printer to be printed (see steps S56-S58 of Fig. 10 of Ozawa et al, which show transmitting data to the printer after the zooming is performed). It is respectfully pointed out, in fact, that the portion of Ozawa et al cited by the Examiner with respect to claim 5 (column 8, lines 35-49) relates only to processing performed by CPU 20, which is the CPU of the digital camera 10 of Ozawa et al. That is, claim 5 is directed to a printer apparatus, while the portion of Ozawa et al cited by the Examiner with respect to claim 5 only relates to processes performed by the camera thereof of Ozawa et al and not to structures of the printer thereof.

It is respectfully submitted that Ozawa et al does not disclose a printer apparatus comprising zoom means for enlarging an image. And it is respectfully submitted that Ozawa et al

therefore cannot possibly disclose control means for limiting a magnification of the image to be printed on the print film, in accordance with the condition of use of the imaging zoom, as according to the present invention as recited in claim 5.

Hidaka et al, moreover, has merely been cited for the disclosure of a printer and digital camera together.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that even if Ozawa et al and Hidaka et al were combinable in the manner suggested by the Examiner, such combination would still not disclose, teach or suggest the features of the present invention as recited in amended independent claim 5, and claim 8 depending therefrom.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 2, independent claim 5, and claims 6 and 8 depending respectively therefrom, clearly patentably distinguish over Ozawa et al and Hidaka et al, taken singly or in combination, under 35 USC 102 as well as under 35 USC 103, along with allowed claims 3, 4 and 7.

* *

Entry of this Amendment, allowance of the claims and the passing of this application to issue are respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number given below for prompt action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Douglas Holtz/

Douglas Holtz
Reg. No. 33,902

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman & Chick, P.C.
220 Fifth Avenue - 16th Floor
New York, New York 10001-7708
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900
Fax No. (212) 319-5101

DH:rjl/iv